# THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIX SEPTEMBER, 1946 No. 315

## Editorial

WE hope that before this number appears the British Government will have made a more definite and satisfactory declaration about its plans for sending home the German prisoners of war than was made in July when the Bishops of Sheffield and Lichfield raised the question in the House of Lords. This is a case where the distinction between self-interested justice and merciful justice is clear. It may well be true that we are legally entitled to keep prisoners of war until a peace treaty has been made, but are we morally entitled to do so? The delay in making peace has been due to the victor powers, and not to the vanquished. A justice informed by mercy and by simple human compassion would have begun as soon as possible the process of repatriating the prisoners, especially those who have been longest in captivity—some have been prisoners for over six years. The hopelessness that has been engendered in them, and the despair of the Western democracies, may already have done irreparable harm. Is there any difference, they wonder, between the professed humane standards of the Anglo-Saxon nations and the inhuman standards of the Nazis? The labour of the prisoners of war is doubtless of great service to Britain, but how is this morally distinguishable from Hitler's slave labour?

Meanwhile, as long as there are prisoners of war in Britain (we gather there are some in the great majority of our parishes), much can be done by the Church to show interest in and sympathy for them. The clergy can obtain a leaflet entitled "Prisoners of War in Great Britain" from the Committee on Prisoners of War, British Council of Churches, 56, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1, which supplies full information about the various services that can be rendered. We urge that the suggestions made in this leaflet be seriously considered, wherever they are not yet known.

* * * * *

We have received a copy of what is described as "the most important publication of 1946"—*The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*.[1] Nor so far are we inclined to dispute the description. It is the work of a strong and widely representative committee of American scholars who have been working on it since 1937. In 1950 they hope to produce a revised translation of the Old Testament. This is not modern translating after the manner of Moffatt or Mgr Knox. It is not a *new* translation, but a revision of the Authorized and Revised Versions. It endeavours to eschew the bald literalism of the Revised Version, to recover the beauty of the Authorized Version while emending its inaccuracies and archaisms, and to be a version that, when read at

[1] Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York. $2

public worship in the twentieth century, will be intelligible to those who hear. The revisers appear to have been remarkably successful in doing all these things at once. While it would be unwise to express too definite an opinion until one has heard it read aloud for a considerable period, we have the impression that this version may well prove to be the best that is available for reading the lessons in church.

Anyhow we hope that an edition will soon be published in Britain. Then a committee of British scholars might be appointed to report on it. Just as the Americans produced their own (slightly modified) edition of the Revised Version of 1881, so it is likely that some modifications of this version would be favoured by British scholars. But whereas in the one case the bulk of the work was done in Britain, in the other it will have been done in America. Thus eventually, for experimental use at first, a new version may be authorized by the Convocations. The American committee has explained the principles on which it worked in a separate booklet, *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*, which contains a valuable collection of short essays by various members of the committee.

## The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism in the Early Roman and Byzantine Liturgies—I

THE subject before us is the relation of Confirmation to Baptism in the Greek and Latin liturgies. Nevertheless, it may be as well to take as our starting-point Richard Hooker and the Elizabethan *Book of Common Prayer*. In his controversy with Cartwright and the Puritans, Hooker was called upon to defend the Anglican institution of Confirmation from the charge that "by tying Confirmation to the bishop alone there is great cause of suspicion given to think that baptism is not so precious a thing as confirmation."[1] In his reply to the charge, Hooker appeals both to the Fathers and to the *Book of Common Prayer*. Of the former he says, "The Fathers everywhere impute unto it (*sc.* confirmation) that gift or grace of the Holy Ghost, not which maketh us first Christian men, but when we are made such, assisteth us in all virtue, armeth us against temptation and sin."[2] Turning to the Prayer Book, Hooker proceeds to argue that the provision therein made for Confirmation harmonizes with the teaching of the Fathers; and he defends his position by reference to the preliminary rubric of the office, according to which "Confirmation is ministered to them that be Baptized, that by imposition of hands and prayer they may receive strength, and defence against all temptations to sin, and the assaults of the world, and the Devil."[3]

For all his judicious Anglicanism, Hooker stands, in his treatment of Confirmation and of its relation to Baptism, in the line of medieval

[1] See *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V, ch. lxvi, 9. (Keble's Oxford edition, Vol. II, p. 347).
[2] *Op. cit.*, V, ch. lxvi, 4 (Oxford edition, p. 340).
[3] This passage appeared in the preliminary rubric of the Confirmation Office in the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552 and 1559, but was removed in 1661.

tradition. The word "Confirmation," as Hooker understands it, means "strengthening"; and if his Anglicanism forbids him to regard the institution as a sacrament, he yet treats it as "a particular invocation" having "a great good effect," no different from that which "Patriarchs, Prophets, Priests, Apostles, Fathers and men of God have had for such their particular invocations and benedictions, as no man I suppose professing truth of religion will easily think to have been without fruit."[1] As an institution of religion, therefore, Confirmation is not lightly to be forgone, and "there is no cause we should doubt of the benefit"[2] of it. In the matter of restricting the ministration of Confirmation to bishops, Hooker allows, "I make not Confirmation any part of that power which hath always belonged only unto bishops, because in some places the custom was that presbyters might also confirm in the absence of a bishop; albeit for the most part none but only bishops were thereof the allowed ministers."[3] In a word, the question of the minister is a matter of custom; and no argument as to an alleged superiority of Confirmation over Baptism rests upon the custom.

That the Puritans were not reconciled to Confirmation by Hooker's learned arguments is well known. Hooker's massive erudition enabled him to make a strong defence of Confirmation as the Elizabethan Prayer Book enjoined it. At the same time he failed to answer the Puritan question whether Confirmation must be considered as adding something to Baptism, and whether, therefore, it is to be held as inferior, superior or equal to Baptism. The Puritans wished to know whether the Anglicans professed to regard Confirmation as essential; and if the Anglicans deprecated such a view, the Puritans further wished to know why the ceremony was retained in the Prayer Book, particularly because the Elizabethan bishops were negligent in ministering Confirmation. To the Puritan mind, Hooker had made no convincing case for the continuance of Confirmation; he appeared merely to be an obstinate upholder of an erroneous official system. Had Hooker fully understood the patristic evidence to which he appealed, his defence of Confirmation would have been differently conceived, and perhaps would have been more pertinent to the objections of his rigidly scripturalist opponents. But, even allowing for the limitations within which he had to work, Hooker is disappointing in his failure to perceive the implications of the writings which he cites. Equally, had he been aware of the value of the liturgical evidence, and taken into account what the Latin Service books to which he had access, and with which he was not unacquainted, could have presented to him, his interpretation of the Fathers would be less defective, and his general understanding of the subject would have gained in accuracy. For the main stream of the baptismal liturgical tradition is presupposed by the Fathers to whom Hooker appeals, and indeed is the ground of their comment or exposition; so that, without some knowledge of that tradition, a reader must inevitably fail to appreciate much of what the

[1] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V, ch. lxvi, 7 (Oxford edition, Vol. II, p. 345). *Ibid.*
[3] *Op. cit.*, VII, ch. vi, 4 (Oxford edition, Vol. III, p. 170).

Fathers have to say about both Baptism and Confirmation. To elucidate that tradition, as it is crystallized in the early Roman and Byzantine baptismal rites, is the purpose of this paper.

The oldest source for the Roman baptismal rite is the oldest extant MS of that type of sacramentary designated as "Gelasian." This MS, now in the Vatican library, and classed as *Reginæ* 316 from having belonged to the collection formed by Queen Christina of Sweden,[1] was written late in the seventh century, or early in the eighth; but we may take it as representing Roman usage of the sixth. Its baptismal rite is prefaced by a serial preparation of the candidates, whose names had been enrolled by the third Sunday in Lent. With the details of the preparation we need not here concern ourselves, except to note that its culminating ceremony, which included the renunciation of Satan and all his pomps and the repetition of the Creed by the candidates, was reserved for the morning of Easter Eve. The Baptism itself was celebrated in the night of Easter Eve, and was followed immediately by the Mass; for at Rome, as elsewhere, a *Missa in nocte* was an integral feature of Paschal observance.

The ancient Roman baptismal rite exhibits the simplicity of order and the austerity of form which are characteristic of all genuine early Roman *liturgica*. After the reading of the Prophecies, the clergy and candidates go in procession to the baptistery. There, a short prayer invoking the divine presence is said, and the bishop blesses the water. The "Blessing of the Font" is a long and stately composition, in which God, whose Spirit was borne over earth's primordial waters that the nature of water might receive therefrom the power of sanctifying, is prayed to expel every unclean spirit from the water of baptism, and, by the operation of His Holy Spirit, to make it "a regenerating water, a purifying stream" to those who are about to be baptized; to the end that the stains of all sins may be washed away, and that human nature, created in the divine image, and by baptism restored to its original dignity, may be cleansed from all the filth of the old man. *That every man*, the Blessing concludes, *entering into this Sacrament of regeneration may be reborn in true innocence, in new childhood.* In the course of the Blessing, the bishop performed certain dramatic actions; he made the sign of the cross over and in the water, he breathed upon it, and, at the end, he poured, crosswise, an ampulla of chrism into it.

The baptismal act followed immediately upon the "Blessing of the Font." Each candidate answered *I believe* to a brief threefold interrogatory of faith put to him by the bishop, and was then immersed three times in the water, while (as we learn from a contemporary document, *Ordo Romanus VII*)[2] the bishop pronounced over him the baptismal formula, *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*

After the newly baptized have come up out of the water, a presbyter marks each of them upon the head with chrism, saying, *Almighty God,*

[1] Edited by H. A. Wilson in *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, Oxford, 1894; for the text of the baptismal rite, see pp. 84 *ff.*

[2] Printed by Mabillon in *Museum Italicum*, Paris, 1724, Vol. II, pp. 77 *ff.*

*the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath regenerated thee of water and the Holy Spirit, Himself anointeth thee with the chrism of salvation unto life eternal.* It was at this point (so we learn again from *Ordo Romanus VII*) that the baptized put on white robes.

We now reach the final movement and climax of the rite. This requires our close attention. So far, it will have been noticed, although the Holy Spirit has been invoked upon the water, and although regeneration has been ascribed to the instrumentality of the water and the Holy Spirit together, nothing has yet been said about the giving of the Holy Spirit to the baptized. That element now makes its appearance. Clothed in their white robes, the baptized are conducted to the Bishop. *Then*, runs the rubric of our sacramentary, *is given to them by the bishop the sevenfold Spirit.*[1] Stretching out his hand over them, the bishop recites a prayer, of which the central petitions are, *Send into them thy Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, and give unto them the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and godliness ; fill them with the Spirit of the fear of God, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.*[2] The prayer ended, the bishop marks each of them upon the forehead with chrism, saying, *The seal of Christ unto life eternal*, and concluding with the dominical greeting, *Peace be with thee.* When all have been signed in this way, the bishop and the baptized return in procession to the cathedral. The bishop celebrates the Mass; and the new Christians, not now dismissed from the church after the Gospel as in the period of their catechumenate, stand with the body of the faithful and receive the Eucharist for the first time.

Brief though it is, this Roman Baptismal Order provides much material for discussion. Detail is better reserved, however, until we have glanced at the Byzantine rite. Suffice it at the moment to note that the Roman rite is not solely baptismal, as we use that adjective to-day. It comprehends Confirmation as well. Baptism and Confirmation are here presented as successive acts within one liturgical action, which would be more correctly described as the Rite of Christian Initiation.

For the Greek, or rather Byzantine, rite, we have no such early evidence as that afforded by the Vatican MS *Reginæ* 316 for Rome. The oldest extant MS containing the rite is a *Euchologion* written about A.D. 800 and now in the Barberini Library in Rome.[3] On the other hand, as the Byzantine rites in general are derived from the Syrian and owe much to Jerusalem, so the Byzantine Baptismal Order is dependent upon the Syrian, and the features of the Jerusalem baptismal rite, which Cyril of Jerusalem expounds in his second and third *Mystagogic Catecheses*, are preserved in the Byzantine Order. We have the support of strong probability, if we carry the Roman rite, as it appears in our earliest "Gelasian" MS, and in *Ordo Romanus VII*, behind the sixth

[1] Denide ab episcopo datur eis Spiritus septiformis.

[2] In an altered form, this prayer is familiar to us as being the first of the prayers of the English Confirmation Service. In 1552, the phrase "Send down . . . upon them," which had appeared in the Prayer Book of 1549, was changed to "strengthen them," which has remained ever since. The change is instructive.

[3] The baptismal rite of this MS is printed in F. C. Conybeare and A. J. Maclean, *Rituale Armenorum*, Oxford, 1905, pp. 389 *ff.*

century into the fifth; but, in the case of the Greek rite now before us, we may be reasonably certain that its main outline and principal features had been established in the fourth century.

At Constantinople, the culmination of Baptismal preparation—*viz.*, the renunciation of Satan and the repetition of the Creed—was reached, not on Easter Eve as at Rome, but on Good Friday. Byzantine usage, however, coincided with Roman in assigning the Baptismal ceremonies to the night of Easter Eve.

Cyril of Jerusalem makes no mention of a blessing of the water; but the Barberini MS provides a long form in which (as in the Roman "Blessing of the Font") God is prayed to cause the Holy Spirit to come upon the water for its sanctification, and is petitioned to protect it from the activity of the "demon of darkness" and the "wicked spirit." There is no allusion in this Greek form to the primordial waters of Genesis i. The interest is rather in the river Jordan: *Give unto the water*, the Patriarch prays, *the blessing of Jordan.* This and certain echoes of Cyril's second *Catechesis* suggest that, perhaps in a shorter form, the Byzantine blessing of the water is to be traced to Jerusalem, and that its origin, like that of other elements in the rite, is assignable to the fourth century. In expressing the purpose of the sanctification of the water, the Greek blessing is similar in sense to the Roman: *Show this water*, the Patriarch prays, *to be water of restoration, water of deliverance, water of sanctification, a cleansing of flesh and spirit from stains, a bath of regeneration, a grant of adoption, a garment of incorruptibility, renewal of the Spirit, a fountain of life.* God is then supplicated to manifest Himself at the water, and to grant that those who are to be baptized in it may be "transformed"[1]—that is to say that they may put off the old man, become corrupt through deceitful lusts, and may be clothed with the new, with that which is restored according to the likeness of the Creator, to the end that, planted together in the likeness of Christ's death by the means of Baptism, they may be made partakers of the Resurrection. Finally, the Greek blessing, unlike the Roman, looks forward to the fulfilment of the life of the baptized: *And guarding the gift of thy Holy Spirit and increasing the deposit of grace committed to them, let them receive the prize of the heavenly calling and be numbered with the firstborn, with those enrolled in heaven in Christ Jesus our Lord.* So, with a doxology, the blessing ends. It may be added that at Constantinople, as at Rome, the sign of the Cross was made upon the water and a vessel of consecrated oil was poured into it.

To the blessing of the water there succeeds an anointing with consecrated oil, each candidate being anointed crosswise on forehead and breast and between the shoulders by the Patriarch, and then upon the whole body by a deacon. The Patriarch's anointing is accompanied by a brief formula, *N. is anointed with the oil of gladness in the Name of the Father*, etc.

The moment of Baptism has now come. The Greek direction governing it is simpler than the Roman. It runs, *And after this* (*sc.* the anointing), *he is baptized by the priest, who says*, "*N. is baptized in*

[1] μεταποιηθῆναι.

*the Name*," etc. There is no profession of faith at this point in the Barberini MS, whether in the form of responses to an interrogatory or of the recital of the Creed. The absence of a profession of faith is probably due to simplification, since Cyril of Jerusalem, in his second *Catechesis*, refers to an interrogatory as preceding the act of Baptism.

The Barberini MS also omits reference to the putting of a white robe upon the newly baptized, when they have come up out of the water. The present Byzantine Baptismal Order directs that "the robes"[1] be put upon them at this point; and such was the medieval usage. That the newly baptized were clothed with white robes in the West Syrian rite of the sixth century we know from the *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* of pseudo-Dionysius.[2] Another West Syrian writer, Theodore of Mopsuestia, witnesses to the white robes nearly two centuries earlier;[3] and Cyril of Jerusalem, though he makes no mention of them in his baptismal *Catechesis*, in that on the Eucharist refers to the "white garments" worn by the baptized. There can be little doubt that the white robe was a continuous feature of Byzantine usage from the beginning. Further, we shall probably not be mistaken if we suppose that the passage from Galatians (iii, 27), *As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ*, which the Patriarch is directed by the Barberini MS to recite at the conclusion of the prayer after baptism, refers to the clothing of the company of the baptized with white robes.

The prayer after baptism is not noticed either by Cyril of Jerusalem or by pseudo-Dionysius. In the rite of the Barberini MS this prayer performs a dual function. It offers thanksgiving for the benefits conferred in baptism and in the post-baptismal anointing—*viz.*, "blessed cleansing," regeneration and remission of all sins, and "divine sanctification"; and it asks that, in what is to follow, yet other benefits may be conferred—*viz.*, "the seal of the gift of the holy and almighty and adorable Spirit," and "participation in the holy Body and precious Blood" of Christ. In short, the prayer after baptism serves to introduce the newly baptized to the climax of their initiation.

In comparison with its simple Roman counterpart, the Byzantine climax appears even simpler. The Patriarch, says the rubric of the Barberini MS, *anoints the baptized with the holy ointment, making the sign of the Cross upon the forehead, the eyes, the nostrils, the mouth and the two ears, and saying, "The seal of the gift of Holy Spirit."* There is no individual greeting of the new Christians as at Rome. The Patriarch concludes the rite by repeating Psalm xxxii, *Blessed are they whose unrighteousnesses are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.* He then proceeds to the celebration of the Liturgy, at which the "newly enlightened" are admitted to the full privilege of Christianity in being admitted to communion.

The "holy ointment," it should be noted, is the Byzantine equivalent of the Roman "chrism." The designation of the latter is more expressive than the Greek "ointment," and recalled to the Roman Christian the

[1] τὰ ἄμφια. [2] Cap. II, iii.
[3] On Baptism, IV, ed. by A. Mingana, Woodbrooke Studies, Vol. VI, Cambridge, 1933, pp. 68, 202.

petition recited in the "Consecration of the Chrism,"[1] on Maundy Thursday, *We beseech thee that thou wouldst vouchsafe to sanctify with thy blessing this thy rich creature of oil, and to mingle therewith the virtue of the Holy Spirit through the power of thy Christ, from whose Holy Name it hath received its own name of "chrism."* The Greek word for "ointment"[2] has nothing of the pregnancy of meaning which belongs to the word "chrism." Nevertheless, the "holy ointment" itself, and the unction with it, have possessed a significance for the Greek Christian mind no less profound than "chrism" and "chrismation" for the Roman, at least since the time of Cyril of Jerusalem, who in his third *Mystagogic Catechesis*, "concerning anointing," writes, "You became christs, when you received the antitype of the Holy Spirit."[3] In every respect, therefore, the Byzantine unction with the ointment corresponds with the Roman unction with the chrism. Both are what we have come to call "Confirmation." The Byzantine Order of Baptism, equally with the Roman, consists of "Baptism" and "Confirmation" linked together within a single rite of Christian initiation. In other words, the two Orders exhibit a common pattern.

It has already been noticed that this pattern is older than the two Orders themselves. Cyril of Jerusalem, as we have seen, witnesses to its existence in his church at the middle of the fourth century. The recovery of Hippolytus's *Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition* has revealed the same pattern as established in Rome at the beginning of the third century,[4] and presumably as believed to have behind it such prescription as to confer upon it the status of an apostolic tradition. Those who are curious for information concerning its wider existence may profitably consult the evidence presented by Dr. A. J. Mason in his *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*.[5] The pattern is, indeed, all but universal. If we do not find it in the remote and isolated church of Eastern Syria, where, until the seventh century, the "sealing" with ointment or oil preceded the baptism with water, yet we learn from references in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, of Irenæus and Tertullian, that the initiatory rites of the heretical Valentinians,[6] the Marcosians[7] and the Marcionites[8] consisted of a baptism followed by a confirmation, and so conformed with the pattern of catholic rites. From these facts, we may reasonably assume that the Romano-Byzantine pattern of initiation represents the main stream of Christian tradition, as we can clearly trace it to the middle of the second century.[9] A glance at a modern *Euchologion* will show that the Byzantine Church has carefully preserved

[1] For the old text of the "consecration," see Wilson, *Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 71 *f.*: *cf.* the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, ed. H. A. Wilson, Henry Bradshaw Society, 1915, pp. 49*f.*

[2] μύρον. [3] χριστοὶ δε γεγόνατε τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὸ ἀντίτυπον δεξάμενοι.

[4] See the edition by G. Dix, Church Historical Society No. 24, 1937, pp. 33*ff.*

[5] Longmans, 1891.

[6] Clem. Al., *excerpta ex Theodoto* 22, 76-86; Irenæus.

[7] Irenæus, *Adv. Hæreses I*, xxi; some Marcosians, however, administered only an unction.

[8] Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, I, xiv.

[9] For the "probable inference" that the use of oil at "confirmation" derives from Apostolic times, see F. H. Chase, *Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*, Macmillan, 1909, pp. 53-60.

the ancient unity of the pattern. The Greek child of to-day is baptized and confirmed upon the same occasion, as were his adult ancestors when they first embraced Christianity. In the Roman West, the pattern has been cut into two pieces, the ministration of Confirmation being normally separated from that of Baptism by an interval of years. In the Roman West, however, Confirmation is still administered by the bishop, except in special circumstances; whereas, in the Byzantine East, the priest who baptizes the child also confirms him with the holy ointment. Roman and Byzantine are agreed, nevertheless, in reserving to the bishop the consecration of chrism and ointment. Since the thirteenth century, also, Roman and Byzantine have been agreed in regarding Baptism and Confirmation as each a sacrament; that is to say that, although the Byzantines have conserved unity of rite, they have come to assert, or virtually to assert, duality of action. We may be tempted to suspect that, in this matter of the initiatory rite, as in much else, the conservatism commonly attributed to the Byzantines is concerned more with form than with content; yet this kind of conservatism, no less than any other, has a significance of its own, and is deserving, in the case before us, of the attentive interest of those who study the history and meaning of Christian institutions.

E. C. Ratcliff.

(*To be concluded.*)

---

## Crown Appointments in Theory and Practice, with Special Reference to the English Episcopate[1]

I. There are only two methods by which a man can be appointed to any office: some form of nomination or some form of election. Neither is perfect because no nominator or body of electors is infallible. They may always turn out to have been mistaken in the man of their choice.

The chances of making a mistake are increased if the appointment is a promotion. A man ought only to be promoted for having done something well; and the fact of his promotion makes it virtually certain that he will never have an opportunity of doing that particular thing again. The authority which advances him says in effect: "You have shown proof of good character and general capacity. We therefore hope that you will be successful in the discharge of different, more arduous and more important duties." As a rule this hope is realized, but not always. It is a matter of common knowledge that from time to time there are failures in the higher ranks of any calling, in the Cabinet, in the Services, on the bench of Judges, as well as on the bench of Bishops. Sometimes appointments which were greeted with general acclamation prove unsuccessful, and sometimes unexpected and unwelcome ones justify themselves completely.

Each method of appointment has its peculiar weakness. The

[1] Written by the Dean of Wells for the Radcliffe Liturgical Library in Liverpool Cathedral. (Reprinted by the kind permission of the Dean of Liverpool.)

individual nominator may be unduly influenced by personal considerations, not always of the best kind, and may be imperfectly informed as to the qualifications demanded by the position to which he has to appoint. Experience has shown again and again that a body of electors seldom has one candidate so outstanding that everyone can accept him without hesitation. Usually there are at least two, both well qualified for the position, if not for quite the same reasons. Neither can command a sufficient majority (a majority of one usually is, and ought to be, considered insufficient) to secure election. In dioceses which elect their Bishop there is always a House of clergy and a House of laity, and the two Houses very seldom seem to want the same man. After several fruitless ballots have been held both the original candidates have to be dropped and a third has to be found whom everyone will agree to accept, although nobody really wants him.

Appointments made in this way are more likely to be safe than bold or brilliant, and *safety first* is not a very exalted maxim; especially for a Church.

II. For more than a thousand years, Bishops in England have been appointed by a combination of the two methods. Naturally from time to time the centre of gravity has shifted. Sometimes it has been in the nominator; sometimes in the electors. Prior to the Norman Conquest, a nomination was usually made by the King and confirmed by the Witenagemote. The Chapter of the Cathedral Church seems to have taken little part. Probably it was seldom sufficiently organized to do so. William the Conqueror observed the old form of nominating at a meeting of the Great Council; but he would have been a bold man who dared to dispute the King's choice. Probably he would not have been in a position to do so twice. The struggle between Henry I and Anselm secured the right of election to the Cathedral Chapters, but as the election did not take place in the Cathedral Church but in a national Council or in one of the Royal Chapels before the justiciar of the Kingdom, it would have been difficult and dangerous to refuse the Royal nominee.[1]

King John gave the Chapters right of free election, as an inducement to the clergy to support him against the barons. This is the meaning of the often-quoted and commonly misunderstood phrase in Magna Carta, *Ecclesia Anglicana Libera Sit.* It was never really effective in practice. Probably few people would desire to see it become so now. The attempts made by Henry III to influence the Chapters led to an increasing flow of appeals to Rome and so augmented the power of the Pope. This reached its height during the next century. In 1349 Clement VI brushed aside the canonical election of Simon Islip to the See of Canterbury and issued a bull which professed to make the appointment. Yet four years earlier he had told his cardinals that if the King of England were to beg for an ass to be made Bishop he must not be denied.[1] The distinction between a petition which must not be refused and a command which must be obeyed is principally one of

[1] See Stephens and Hunt, *A History of the English Church*, Vol. II, p. 283.
[2] Stephens and Hunt, Vol. III, pp. 86-7.

terminology. Papal pretensions were curbed by the strong hand of King Edward III with the statutes of Provisors (1351) and Præmunire (1353). It is open to question whether the Church gained or lost by these measures, but the rights of the Crown were made more secure. When the Reformation put a final end to all foreign interference with our affairs, it merely meant that the power of the Crown became in theory what it had been in practice for the best part of a couple of centuries, and that the need for disguising it with complimentary verbiage lapsed.

III. To-day a *Crown Appointment* means an appointment made by the Sovereign acting on advice tendered to him by the Prime Minister of the day. When advice has been tendered formally, the Sovereign is bound to accept it. How much informal discussion may have taken place between them first is of course not known. The published letters of Queen Victoria show that in her time there was often a good deal. But it is of course true that the ultimate decision rests, in fact, with the Prime Minister. Some people regard this method of appointing Bishops as undesirable, because the Prime Minister need not be a member of the Church of England, or indeed profess any religion of any kind. The objection is not entirely frivolous but cannot be considered to carry much weight, because it ignores the fact that he does not act in his personal but in his representative capacity. Besides bishoprics, appointments are made in the same way to all deaneries and to some of the canonries in some Cathedrals. Also to some of the most important professorships in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, St Andrews, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen, as well as to the mastership of the most important College in Cambridge[2] (if not in the world) and to the headship of one of the largest and most famous of English schools. The Prime Minister cannot be a member of all these great institutions and may never have had any close connexion with any of them. The principle underlying Crown appointments outside its own immediate service is that certain positions are sufficiently important to be matters of national concern. It matters to the nation as a whole by whom they are filled. Therefore the filling of them cannot be left to any local authority, which (human nature being as it is) is only too likely to mean local jealousy and local intrigue. The Sovereign and the Prime Minister together represent the nation as no other men can pretend to do. They embody the two sources of authority which we recognize (and it is not easy to see how there can be a third, unless we admit Violence): Hereditary Right, and Power derived ultimately from the electorate.

The first prerequisite of making good appointments in any walk of life is to survey the whole field of choice adequately. The Sovereign and the Prime Minister are obviously better placed for doing this than anyone else can be and also are in a position to consult with anyone they choose to any extent they please. Probably they are the last two men in the Kingdom who would lay claim to infallibility.

[1] Also to the largest College in Oxford, where the mastership is attached to the deanery of the Cathedral.

The Crown appointment has the further advantage that the nominee does not have to take up the duties of his diocese or professorship or whatever it may be with the full knowledge that a considerable number of those with whom he will have to deal did their best to get somebody else, and that his unsuccessful rival is probably among them.

It is observable that bishops who have been appointed to dioceses overseas by free election are usually quite ready to return to our "degrading bondage" after a few years should an opportunity present itself.

It may be added that whenever a see has to be filled the needs of the Bench of Bishops ought to be taken into account, as well as those of the diocese concerned. In what respect does the Episcopate need reinforcement at this juncture is a really important consideration. It is, however, unlikely that it would occur to any body of diocesan electors, or that they would be in a position to deal with it if it did.

IV. The process by which a diocesan bishopric is filled in England to-day is as follows:

1. The Chapter Clerk informs the Crown (in this connexion the Prime Minister's Patronage Secretary) of the vacancy and asks that licence may be given to the Dean and Chapter to fill it. This licence is the *congé d'élire* and is accompanied by a *letter missive* containing the name of the person recommended by the Crown.

2. Within twelve days after the receipt of these documents the Dean summons the Chapter to meet in the Chapter House to carry out the election. For this purpose (and for some others) the Chapter is now usually understood to include the honorary canons, or non-residentiary prebendaries as well as the residentiaries. It is usual to hold this meeting immediately after divine service in the quire, and for the electors to go from quire to Chapter House in procession.

3. When the electors have taken their seats in the Chapter House they are preconized by the Chapter Clerk and the Dean declares all absentees to be *contumacious*. This does not expose them to any penalty but precludes any subsequent attempt to invalidate the proceedings on the ground of their absence. The Dean then asks the Chapter by what method they wish to proceed. Traditionally there are three:

(*a*) *Per scrutinium*. By ballot. In the event of a tie the Dean has a second or casting vote.

(*b*) *Per compromissum*. This is a form borrowed from Roman Law. The electors choose some of their number to act for them, pledging themselves to accept their decision whatever it may be. The number of *compromittores* must not be more than one-seventh of the number of members of the Chapter present and must always be an even number (two, four, or six) so that when they act with the Dean a tie is impossible. Probably this method is seldom followed.

(*c*) *Per inspirationem*. By acclamation. The Dean asks the electors whether they think that the person who has been recommended to them as Bishop is worthy of election to the see. If they agree they stand up in their places and say *He is worthy*.

Sometimes the question is put in Latin and the answer returned in that language. English can, however, be employed throughout.

4. When the Chapter have decided upon their method of procedure the election is carried out accordingly. The electors then leave the Chapter House in procession and return to their stalls in the quire. The Dean then declares the election publicly, first from the steps of the high altar and then from the entrance to the quire.

Such election is not a farce. The electors cannot reject the nominee of the Crown merely because they think they know of someone whom they would prefer. But if they believed that he was unfit for the episcopate on grounds of faith or morals, and could adduce sufficient reason for their belief, they could refuse to elect. They could not substitute another name, but could request the Crown to do so. Theoretically such refusal would expose them to very severe penalties under the Statute of Præmunire. But as the precise nature of these penalties seems to be uncertain it is doubtful whether any of them could be enforced. In any case, if the Chapter were obviously in the right they would certainly win. Public opinion would be upon their side so overwhelmingly that no Government would dare to touch them. The Crown would be compelled to withdraw its first nominee and put forward a better one. Thus the election is a real and effective safeguard against any abuse of the royal supremacy. Moreover, whatever the previous steps had been, there would have to be a formal meeting of the Dean and Chapter, as representing the clergy of the diocese, to ratify solemnly a decision which had been reached elsewhere: as treaties have to be ratified by plenipotentiaries representing the nations concerned before they can take effect, after their provisions have been determined exactly elsewhere.

Election is followed by confirmation. This is a purely legal ceremony at which representatives of the Crown satisfy themselves that the election has been duly carried out, that the person before them who professes to have been elected by the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of X really has been and is the person whose name appears in the letter missive.

When a Bishop-elect has been confirmed he can exercise all the jurisdiction of the see, whether he is in episcopal orders or not—*e.g.*, present to benefices.

Consecration is performed by the Archbishop of the Province, who must be assisted by at least two diocesan bishops of the same Province. If the Archbishop cannot act for any reason there must be at least four bishops. The position of the consecrators is closely analogous with that of the electors at an earlier stage. They could refuse to act, if there were adequate grounds for refusal. Here again there is a real and effective safeguard against any abuse of the royal supremacy.

After consecration the bishop does homage. This is not considered to mean that his episcopal character and spiritual authority are derived from the Crown. They have been transmitted by the Church, through the channels of Election and Consecration. Homage relates to the possessions of the see. Originally each bishopric had its own estates. When the see became vacant they reverted to the Crown for safe custody and were granted again to the next bishop as soon as he was qualified to receive them. More than a century ago all the episcopal estates

were transferred to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. But the ancient form is maintained; and the new bishop cannot receive from the Commissioners the income to which he is entitled until homage has been done.

Last of all comes Enthronement (*Inthronization* is probably the correct form) in the Cathedral Church. In the Northern Province this is done by the Dean. In the Southern Province this is done by the Archdeacon of Canterbury. This ceremony is probably unnecessary as it does not appear to possess any legal significance. It is, however, of long standing, and may be regarded as the formal public presentation of the new bishop to the people of his diocese.

At the same time he is installed by the Dean in the Chapter House. This ceremony, which is attended by members of the Chapter only, is probably essential as it constitutes the bishop Visitor of the Chapter. In some Cathedrals Latin is used for part of this.

V. The process by which diocesan bishops are appointed in England has a thousand years or more of history behind it. Each step has a real and peculiar significance. The process has developed as is natural in a country which has become increasingly accustomed to act through representative persons and institutions. The system is not perfect; nor is any other. It must be a matter of opinion whether any alternative would serve the Church of England more effectively. Those who are inclined to cavil at its results should perhaps remember that no less than twelve new dioceses have been created since the beginning of the present century and that it may be easier to create additional bishoprics than to find men adequate to fill them.

They may also recall the opening words of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*:

"He that goeth about to persuade a multitude that they are not so well governed as they ought to be shall never want attentive and favourable hearers; because they know the manifold defects whereunto every kind of regiment is subject, but the secret lets and difficulties which in public proceedings are innumerable and inevitable they have not ordinarily the judgement to consider."

R. H. Malden.

---

## Why You Should Read It—III

### COLERIDGE'S "AIDS TO REFLECTION"

Of Coleridge's philosophical and theological works published after *Biographia Literaria* (1817), *Aids to Reflection* (1825) alone commanded any considerable circulation. The influence of Coleridge on philosophy in England was exercised mainly through this book and through his conversations at Highgate. The *Table Talk*, *The Constitution of Church and State according to the Idea of each*, and the volumes of marginalia were studied by those who had already been influenced. Coleridge's disciples were but few, in a country little given to metaphysics, in an

unmetaphysical age, when the radical young were followers of Bentham and Mill. He was the philosopher of Tories and Churchmen when most Churchmen shunned philosophy. Among the High Churchmen Charles Marriott and Hugh James Rose, outside the normal run of church parties Julius Hare, F. J. A. Hort, and F. D. Maurice bore the plainest marks of his influence. In a more remote and diffuse way it may be said to have affected Thomas Arnold, J. H. Newman, R. W. Church, R. H. Hutton, and Charles Kingsley.

In the minds of hostile critics and of some friends the philosophy of Coleridge was identified with Germanism, because he was the first Englishman to make play with Kant's distinction between the speculative and the practical reason. But his own distinction between the reason and the understanding was only superficially similar to Kant's. The philosopher of Highgate and the philosopher of Königsberg were both engaged in battle with the empiricism of the eighteenth century; but the whole purpose of Coleridge was to restore sense and meaning to the older philosophy of Plato, the Scholastics (especially Duns Scotus, his favourite), the Anglican divines, especially Hooker, and the Cambridge Platonists. Reason in these writers must be distinguished from "the faculty of judging according to sense," the later, more limited reason that flourished in the eighteenth century. In developing this distinction he discovered in the older Reason a moral nature, a character of faith, of response to a revelation, that carried it beyond the sphere where the Scholastics would have wished to confine natural reason and natural philosophy. But if the Coleridgean Reason is moral as well as rational, and in "the light that lightens every man that cometh into the world" apprehends truths of faith that are denied to the Reason of the Scholastics, it is never conceived as merely moral. It was no part of Coleridge's purpose to deny access to the thing in itself.

He was able to raise up in England a small body of speculative thinkers who did believe in the validity of the philosophical tradition of Europe before the seventeenth century, without denying the achievements of science in its own sphere since Descartes, Newton, and Locke. F. D. Maurice's *History of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, in its scope and in its limitations, is derived from Coleridge's suggestions. The approach to Biblical criticism characteristic of Hort and Westcott is directly derived from his *Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit*.

Coleridge originally came to his conception of reason through his inquiry into the functions of fancy and imagination, stimulated by the problems raised in his acute mind by Wordsworth's poetry and his own. The significance of his philosophy and theology for us in the twentieth century does not lie in his particular conclusions, which are often inchoately framed, and sometimes reflect the political and religious prejudices of the most insular period in Anglican history. What is important is his grasp of the principle that any and every philosophy of life implies a response of the imagination and the will to experience as a whole. Every philosopher is a poet, and every great poem implies a philosophy. No nation can afford to be without a philosophy of life, elaborated, sustained, and applied by a clerisy or intelligentsia. In *Aids*

*to Reflection* he is not yet concerned to elaborate his distinction between the national clerisy and the priesthood of the Catholic Church in England. That was left for *The Constitution of Church and State according to the Idea of each.* There are, however, many pointers in this direction:

"Wherever there exists a permanent Learned Class, having authority and possessing the respect and confidence of the country; and wherever the Science of Ethics is acknowledged, and taught in *this* class as a regular part of a learned education to its future members generally, but as the special study and indispensable groundwork of such as are intended for Holy Orders;—*there* the Article of Original Sin will be an AXIOM of Faith in all Classes. Among the Learned an undisputed truth, and with the People a fact, which no man imagines it possible to deny, the Doctrine, thus inwoven in the faith of all, and coeval with the consciousness of each, will for each and all possess a reality, *subjective* indeed, yet virtually equivalent to that which we intuitively give to the Objects of our Senses."

On the other hand "where Religion is valued and patronised as a supplement of Law, or an Aid extraordinary of Police; where a lax moral SCIENCE is exploded as a mystic Jargon of Dark Ages; where a lax System of Consequences . . . is publicly and authoritatively taught as Moral Philosophy; where the Mysteries of Religion, and Truths supersensual, are either cut and squared for the comprehension of the Understanding, the faculty of judging according to Sense, or desperately torn asunder from Reason, nay, fanatically opposed to it: lastly, where Private Interpretation is everything and the Church nothing—*there* the Mystery of Original Sin will be either rejected, or evaded, or perverted into the monstrous fiction of Hereditary Sin, Guilt inherited: in the Mystery of Redemption metaphors will be obtruded for the reality; and in the mysterious Appurtenants and Symbols of Redemption (Regeneration, Grace, the Eucharist, and Spiritual Communion) the realities will be evaporated into metaphors." (From Aphorism CXII on Spiritual Religion.)

To Coleridge Original Sin was no distinctively Christian doctrine but "a fact acknowledged in *every* Religion that retains the least glimmering of the patriarchal faith in a God infinite, yet *personal.*" In his own day the fact was obscured and denied, not only among Latitudinarians, but in his view among Roman Catholics and orthodox High Churchmen in the Arminian tradition. He therefore himself leaned to the Evangelical remnant, and professed his agreement with the sacramental doctrine of Bucer and Cranmer, though not with the sacramentarianism attributed to Cranmer by the ingenuity of his modern adversaries. But it was no accident that his philosophy was appropriated by High Churchmen, and became the seedbed, according to Carlyle, of "spectral Puseyisms."

For in a footnote to Aphorism CXII on Spiritual Religion, cited above, Coleridge wrote firmly in capitals and italics:

"My fixed principle is: that A CHRISTIANITY WITHOUT A CHURCH EXERCISING SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY IS VANITY AND DISSOLUTION. And my *belief* is, that when Popery is rushing in on us like an inundation, the Nation will find it to be so. I say *Popery*; for this too I

hold for a delusion, that Romanism or *Roman* Catholicism is separable from Popery. Almost as readily could I suppose a circle without a Centre."

*Aids to Reflection* is not easy reading. It is rather a book to browse in than an argument to follow consecutively to a conclusion. A good deal of it is marginalia on the theology of Archbishop Leighton, a friend of Port Royal and the Jansenists, who tried to pacify the controversies of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism in Scotland in the seventeenth century. To that century Coleridge constantly turned, in search of a lost tradition. His reflections, like the thoughts of Pascal, are fragmentary, because he could not speak directly to his own age. The like difficulties drove Maurice to incoherence, Kierkegaard to oblique statement, and Hort to an almost complete silence. All these writers were strangers to their own age, and are contemporaries in our own. Of Kierkegaard, Maurice, and Pascal this is widely recognized. The discovery of Coleridge has been slower, partly because he had an influence, and not altogether a healthy one, on the literary criticism of the nineteenth century, while his intellectual influence was confounded with the later idealistic wave from Germany, against which we have been in reaction in the last twenty or thirty years. He deserves a more complete re-examination, by those who owe to him, much more than to any other person, the freedom of the Church of England from the simple antithesis of fundamentalism and modernism. And that examination will have to begin with *Aids to Reflection*. The later books depend upon it. The earlier essays, in *The Friend*, and at the end of *Biographia Literaria*, are too entangled in current political and literary controversies to be readable at all. In *Aids to Reflection* Coleridge meanders, advances, retreats, turns back upon himself and his authorities, but he is always meditating upon universal issues.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

---

# CORRESPONDENCE

## WHAT IS THE LAITY?

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

SIR,

This letter is meant to be no more than notes to provoke a discussion.

There are two themes which one hears fairly often canvassed to-day: that of the place of the laity in the *ecclesiastical life* of the Church (their responsibility for evangelism, the value of " cells," of the Parish or Church meeting, etc.), and that of the place of the laity in the field of *secular responsibility* (the " Christian Frontier," etc.). But the problem as I see it—and find little to answer—is how far these two themes are actually one and the relation between them in our actual situation.

Consider each in its turn.

I. *The Laity and the interior life of the Church.*—Briefly, as an Anglican, I should be inclined to say that the Churches which have a real place

for the laity have lost the historic ministry with all that that implies, whilst the Churches which have retained the historic ministry have become clericalized. To which some would reply, on the one hand (the left), that if the historic ministry means clericalism it is well lost; on the other (the right) hand, that the Church is all the better for being clerical (in a *good* sense of the word, of course) and that the laity have, in Protestantism, too often got above themselves. Others, of whom I am one, are not satisfied with either answer.

I freely admit that Catholicism has a tradition of clericalism which has constantly imperilled its true catholicity. Dom Gregory Dix has some valuable words on this in *The Shape of the Liturgy* (pp. 18, 19). There he is discussing the decline in lay communicants, which began in the fourth and fifth centuries, but was at its lowest in the seventh, owing to the indiscriminate admissions to the Church after the whole of society became nominally Christian. It was then that worship began to reflect a loss of true balance between priests and people in the organic life of the Church.

The problem of clericalism haunts the whole of Christendom, but in the Catholic tradition it is aggravated by theological developments in doctrines of grace, sacraments, and orders which are easily exploited by the clergy in the interests of their personal power. The affinities of Catholicism with Fascism, though partly due to a common dislike of liberalism, also have sinister implications for Catholicism's liking of authoritarian rule and contempt for the common man.

In the Church of England this latent tendency in the Catholic tradition has been unhappily fortified since the eighteenth century by a tendency to class-stratification in the ministry. Although the squire-parson axis may be broken in fact, even in village life, it has by no means disappeared from the *mentality* of either clergy or laity in the Church of England.

But equally, in losing the historic ministry, the Protestant Churches became liable to a splintering process which has littered the earth with separated sects which, whatever their other merits (for which thanks be to God) have a meagre sense of the Una Sancta. Sometimes, as in the Lutheran tradition, catholic hierarchy yielded place merely to secular hierarchy. (Indeed Anglicanism bears marks, not easily eradicated, of rule by a lay " Supreme Governor.") Sometimes, as in Calvinism, a new ecclesiastical hierarchy was erected in its place, in which the University Professor, the seminary Principal or the elderly Elder exercised a despotism which left the ordinary Church member very much where he was—at the back of the Church. It is in Independency that the process of restoring a responsible priesthood of the laity was most courageously enterprised, and I for one am full of admiration for that aspect of Independency, which breathes so fiercely in the letters of Cromwell and in the proceedings of the Ironsides. But there are those among their heirs to-day who will admit that in residue it has become a dictatorship of the commonplace, an egalitarianism of little men (and their wives) and not a "rule of Saints." The Cromwellians, after all, were very aristocratic in their methods, albeit a new aristocracy. Of Methodism, I confess that I feel the creation of lay-preachers to be no

true solution, for in my experience it has succeeded only in breeding a class of men who, in spite of manifold graces, have become as "professional" in their attitude to the rank-and-file as any paid ministry. Since Methodism became largely middle-class I have the impression that this "professionalism" in the lay-preacher is fortified. In brief, Protestantism has first lost such virtues as there are in ecclesiastical hierarchy and then popped in Moderators, Superintendents, and General Secretaries to replace the vanished Bishops.

I have no wish to travesty or to pit the good in one tradition against the bad in another. These sketchy generalizations doubtless contain injustices which a longer and more qualified treatment would modify. But even so they would surely raise a sociological issue in Church life which cannot be ignored. Dean W. L. Sperry in his very interesting book *Religion in America* points out how the small American sects which are anti-clericalist and lay-led in their early stages become clericalized in the membership if the sect ceases to be drawn from the under-privileged amongst whom it started and acquires enough wealth to give its ministry a college education. I think it probable that here we have a repetition under modern conditions of a process which is independent of theological doctrines about the ministry and was operative, in its own way, in the medieval Church. Education, in any society, spells power. Power, in any society, is jealously guarded by any class that acquires it. The content of education varies—but it is essentially the same process of acquiring privileged knowledge which creates priestly power whether by the witch-doctor, the Egyptian priest, the medieval clerk, or a deacon in the "Duck River and Kindred Associations of Baptists" (Sperry, p. 98; *cf.* pp. 177 *ff.*).

I believe we have to re-think our whole doctrine of ministry and laity in the light of the Catholic-Reformed conflict but not in restriction to its presuppositions. And, in this very matter, we have much to learn from the Orthodox East. God knows where we shall finish up, but certain lessons of the New Testament Church and its heirs seem tolerably clear.

(1) Our whole present use of "laity" is unscriptural. The *laos* of God comprises both what we now call clergy and laity.

(2) But there *must* be some kind of hierarchy—*i.e.*, gradation of function. Order and continuity must be preserved, and I believe the episcopate to be the divinely shaped, though gravely misused, tool for doing it. Word and Sacraments must have "faithful ministers": those commissioned for that work have an "indelible character" engraved upon them by the nature of their commission.

(3) There must be effective safeguards against the abuse of those offices. Although *gradation* of function implies greater and less dispensability it does not necessarily imply greater and less intrinsic worth and must not be allowed to appear to do so. Unregenerate human nature will always try to exploit uniqueness of function into uniqueness of privilege. There is no ultimate sanction against that but the sanctifying Spirit of God. But there are safeguards: among them I would name the primitive practices of the reality of synodal government and the voice of the laity in the choice of bishops.

(4) But we are not nearly clear enough wherein lie the unique and inalienable rights and duties of the laity. Our thinking, in all Churches, is too much bound by a conception of giving and receiving classes, of shepherds and sheep. Some of us Anglicans can bear testimony to what we have learned in Parish Meetings and so forth. Even more, we have begun to see the things which must be explored. For example, we need to be clearer about the distinctions between *leadership*, *chairmanship*, and *friendship*. When I was snatched, protesting, from my parish, I had just begun to see that a good definition of the special priesthood is that it is the calling to foster in the laity the deepest possible understanding of their priesthood as believers. The priest is doing so at the altar, and the whole form and manner of the Eucharist should express the corporate worship of a Church in which Christ in His Body passes through Oblation to Sacrifice, and, through Sacrifice, by Communion passes on to His redeeming work outside the church doors. The priest in baptism receives into the Body those in whom Christ is to be formed within the whole reciprocity and coinherency of the Body; in absolution the barriers that restrain the work of Christ are broken; in benediction, the blessing of God is renewed on the on-going work of the Body; in teaching, the inherent responsibilities of the baptized are unfolded; in evangelism, their apostolic calling is guided and encouraged.

(5) But there the privileges of priesthood come to an abrupt end. It is a great work as far as it goes, but much remains which the priest as priest cannot do. His primary work is to release and to reveal in others power to do work which they alone can do or, at best, in which he can sometimes join them as one of themselves. But over a whole vast field, he cannot even do that. It is here we come up against our second theme.

II. *The Laity and the Secular World.*—As a mere cleric, I hesitate to venture on to this minefield. There is at least one preliminary confusion to be avoided. The term *laity* in this context is not necessarily synonymous with its meaning in the former context. There it meant the mass of the members of the Church who are not ordained to specific functions within it. Here it means those who earn their living from exercising responsibilities in the secular world and so develop an outlook and know experiences very different from those of the whole-time employees of the Church. The two senses of "laity" can thus be confused and have border-line cases. But even a cleric may try to indicate something of the situation which faces the layman in the secular world.

(1) First, the Christian Church is set in the world to act always in the tension between the absolute of Revelation and the relativities of history. The Incarnation, the very Absolute to which it appeals, is itself historically conditioned in that Jesus was a Jew of a certain date. Ever since He lived and died and rose again, the Church has had to witness to what those events mean in changing circumstances.

(2) Secondly, the Church can expect no *final* formulation, therefore, of her testimony, this side of Christ's coming again. All her formulations are conditioned both by time and by sin.

(3) Thirdly, the age in which *we* are set to witness is unique in history for at least these three reasons:

(*a*) We live in a *post-Christian era.* That is to say we face neither a structure of society which has not yet accepted the judgment of Christianity on it nor yet one which has, but one which has known that judgment and widely repudiated it. But not before the structure of society has had incorporated into it a multitude of features which it owes to Christianity, whether or no it acknowledge the debt. We can therefore never deal with society as though there were no vestigial Christianity in it. In particular, we in Britain must face *our* historic heritage and not take refuge in a romantic projection either into European pessimism or into American or Russian optimism.

(*b*) The age of modern techniques has a unique pattern of *possibilities.* Even without speculating on the use of atomic energy, we can see that man's new weapons have created at once a more interdependent age and an age of more complete specializations. The principle of the "autonomy of the secular"—which has always been true (*e.g.*, in medieval painting it was skill in paint, not piety, which made a great artist)—now has more decisive consequences for the fate of men.

(*c*) The concept of *democracy* has been discovered and can never again be altogether forgotten. However we assess the degree of the dependence on Christianity of modern democracy, there has entered into history a conception of the responsibility of power to the general mass of men which can never again be ignored. All future tyrants will violate an unforgettable dream; all future democracies will seek an irrepressible vision.

(4) So, fourthly, all these distinctive characteristics of our age underline the importance of the laity in the Church.

(*a*) The first, the post-Christian era, because Christendom was so largely a "clerisy"[1] that its repudiation throws open the question between clergy and people with new insistence. Further, the vestigial Christianity, which is so important a factor in our destiny, is the stuff of the daily lives of laymen far more than of the clergy, who often contrive to move for most of our lives in a little circle where we get our own way because we are still important *as* clergy. We have all received the compliment of the typical vestigial Christian—"But *you* are not a bit like an ordinary parson." In that world, Christian things have to be forgiven for being Christian before they can become effective. The layman must spend his days in a witness which is often valued in proportion as he can conceal its *Christian* basis.

(*b*) Obviously the growth of techniques and specialisms, the concentration of power in fewer and more important centres, all put a premium on the influence of Christian laymen. There is no simple solution to be found in the Buchmanite strategy of "converting key men." Further, if there was ever any hope that ecclesiastics could rightly govern society by being the best equipped people to do it, the hope evaporates in the face of the sheer complexity of every major administrative task. Ecclesiastics are no longer even the best equipped people *to talk* about governing society, as their continuance to do so amply proves.

(*c*) And finally, the experience of democracy has introduced into the

[1] In Coleridge's sense, revived by Mr Eliot in *The Idea of a Christian Society.*

*interior* life of the Church standards which were not articulated before and cannot be ignored. We may sneer at secular democracy (we should be silly to do so), but the world will continue to ask whether its deepest insights into the meaning of freedom are to be found within the Church. We can't get out of their challenge by glib talk about the Church being a theocracy and not a democracy; unless that "theocracy" at least equals the democrat's reverence for man it is not the rule of the Father of Jesus Christ.

(5) Finally this lay vocation of the Christian is one which the ecclesiastically minded always find it hard to grasp. I know not only how easily I myself tend to make the discussion of *all* questions into a discussion of Church questions, but I also always find it difficult to get the kind of layman who is at all deeply within Church life to think about his Christian vocation in his job in terms of that job and not simply in terms of the standards he learnt in home, Sunday School and Catechism—of kindness, purity and personal honesty. Of course such standards are relevant to a works manager trying to do his job well, but they are not the distinctive managerial standards. It will take a sustained and widespread effort before the distinction is widely grasped in the Church.

Happily I said at the beginning that I had no intention of trying to reconcile these two themes, but only to try to state their relationship as being in itself a problem. I will only try to make a few obvious points in the hope of starting a profitable discussion.

(1) We can thank God that some good thinking is going on in all this field and do our best to follow it. Readers of THEOLOGY will be familiar with the relevant writings of Maritain, Eliot, Niebuhr, Brunner, etc., and will forgive me for being so obvious.

(2) However, my impression is that we have got very little way in embodying those big books in little experiments. Parish meetings, Church meetings, cells, Christian Workers' Union, sundry community experiments, and what-not are feeling their way, but not as yet on a scale which greatly changes current practices of Church life. In so far as there is real life in such experiments, time alone will bring results. As yet they seem to be more effective in bringing new life into the Christian community than in sending lively Christians out into the world. A horrible stumbling-block is simply *time*. To be an effective Christian to-day takes lots of time. The whole problem of the *intensity* of Christian fellowship adequate to overcome the deadening effects of modern society is at stake here. A valuable study in this problem is given by Mr W. G. Symons in his chapter of the new British Council of Churches symposium, *Christian Witness in the Post-War World*. But he postulates a formidable degree of energy.

(3) The layman-in-his-Christian-congregation and the layman-in-secular-society seem to be fused best in some form of *community life—e.g.*, experiments like Iona, the Pilgrim Players, John Middleton Murry-like farmers. But such a solution revives the "double standard" of monasticism—valuable and essential in its place—but leaving untouched the sort of lay posts whose responsibilities can only be exercised by whole-heartedly joining the *secular* community—*e.g.*, the school-

master in the all-absorbing modern school. Are there forms of community-tie which leave a man yet free to be wholly effective in his secular sphere? Did experience in the Forces teach Christians anything here?

(4) Finally, ought parsons *alone* to be trusted in our day to discuss any important topic? It would be foolish for us to pretend to be other than ourselves. The problem is not even approached by "clergymen wearing soft collars and pretending to be just as nice as laymen." By God's grace, we are priests and rejoice to be so. But can we faithfully fulfil even our priestly functions in the false situation which has arisen to disturb the true *organic* functioning of the Church in which, together, we are the *laos* of God?

There are reputed to be some laymen who read THEOLOGY. If so, I dedicate these notes of inquiry especially to them.

Yours in the cloth,
OLIVER S. TOMKINS.

21 BLOOMSBURY STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff is Professor of Liturgical Theology in the University of London.

The Very Rev. R. H. Malden is Dean of Wells.

Brother George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

The Rev. O. S. Tomkins is Assistant General Secretary of the World Council of Churches.

# BOOK REVIEWS

COLLECTED PAPERS OF EVELYN UNDERHILL. Edited by Lucy Menzies with an Introduction by Lumsden Barkway, Bishop of St Andrews. Longmans, Green and Co. 6s.

In 1943 a volume of the letters of Evelyn Underhill was published with an introduction by Charles Williams. Then, in 1944, under the title *Light of Christ*, some addresses given at the House of Retreat at Pleshey in 1932 were printed, with a memoir by Lucy Menzies. And finally, there is this volume of collected papers with an introduction by the Bishop of St Andrews. With the letters and the materials afforded by the prefaces to these three books, some idea can be gained of what manner of person it was who exercised by her writings and by her life so considerable an influence and in such widely different places. Many of us had the privilege of seeing and hearing her, for not only did she conduct retreats, but she would be found reading papers before such bodies as the British Society for Franciscan Studies, being herself a good Franciscan scholar, an authority on Jacopone da Todi and the Blessed Angela of Foligno. She had a quiet, shy, but determined manner in public discourse, and those who knew her have spoken of her strong sense of humour and her great humility. The outward circumstances of her life were such as are usually described as favourable or fortunate,

but she early learned to use them for the purposes for which they were given.

When in 1899 Dr Inge gave his Bampton Lectures on *Christian Mysticism* he gathered a large audience and, afterwards, many readers; and William James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*, delivered as the Gifford Lectures for 1901-2, met with a like recognition. The new psychology; the still strong and often Christian philosophical idealism; the desire to find a way of belief which could by-pass the historical criticism of the documents of the Christian faith; the willingness to hear and discuss a new thing—all these helped to make books on mysticism and on the mystics of past ages sure of a ready reception. It was significant that Evelyn Underhill's first book, *Mysticism*, has as its sub-title " A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness." It was followed by the *Mystic Way*, a book which, Mr Charles Williams tells us, "she came to distrust and dislike as 'false doctrine.' " She was still affected by the subjective, "immanent," psychological suppositions, and it was not until she came under the influence of Friedrich von Hügel that she saw how much more the emphasis must be laid on what he called "the Reality distinct from ourselves, the Self-subsistent Spirit, God," who is other than and beyond our apprehension of Him, the inexhaustible "ocean of Himself—of Love—apart from all creation."

"I want you to hold very clearly the *otherness* of God, and the littleness of men. If you don't get that you can't have adoration, and you cannot have religion without adoration": so von Hügel wrote to his niece, and he taught it likewise to Evelyn Underhill. The other thing he showed her was the meaning of Grace, the action of the divine prevenience, which was utterly opposed—in her own words—"to all merely evolutionary or emergent theories of spiritual transcendence."

The Baron became her spiritual director and he brought her to a fuller acceptance of the Catholic faith, with its insistence on the historical, the visible, the sacraments and the liturgy. She was already conscious of all this, but he guided her surely and firmly, and under his influence she turned also to the poor, for, as Huvelin had said (he had been the Baron's own spiritual guide), "when our Lord is living in a heart, he bestows on it his own thoughts and feelings and the heart is inclined towards the poor." Charles Williams, who knew Evelyn Underhill, says: "The strange sense in which the poor, merely by being poor, are thought of as being the Body of Christ; almost as if the mere not-having made a man closer to the Incarnate than ever, in itself, could the having, seems to have been familiar to her."

As a result of this entering into the life of the Church, she began to exercise a greater influence on souls. That influence was, indeed, twofold. In the first place, her writings (and among these the earlier writings to which I have referred) came to many, as they did to the Bishop of St Andrews, at a time of need; in his own words, "they threw open a door before which I had been standing all my life longing to get through." There can be no doubt that many of her readers followed her own spiritual progress into the full acceptance of the life of the Body of Christ. In the second place, and perhaps most important of all, was her

personal contact with all manner of people which is revealed in her letters and in addresses, many of them given at retreats which she conducted for women at Pleshey and elsewhere. Some of these are collected in the present volume and others in the volume *Light of Christ*. As we read, we can hear her speak and we can feel the atmosphere of the Retreat House at Pleshey which Miss Menzies has described so beautifully in the memoir at the beginning of the book to which I have just referred. The titles of some of the addresses—"Life as Prayer," "Worship," "The Inside of Life," "The Parish Priest and the Life of Prayer," "The Teacher's Vocation," "The Spiritual Life of the Teacher," "Education and the Spirit of Worship"—show how varied is the interest of the volume of *Collected Papers*. They will find many readers, especially among those who need or have themselves to give practical help in the living of the spiritual life.

F. J. E. Raby.

Harpenden.

---

Melancthon, Alien or Ally? By Franz Hildebrandt. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

This book is exciting, for two reasons. First, as it is the first modern theological study of Melancthon in English, it should be a landmark in the re-education of the English as to the meaning and content of the message of the German Reformation. Second, it makes an attempt at a real dialogue between the Renaissance and the Reformation traditions (as distinct from our customary Hyde Park method of shouting past one another from academic tubs, to the accompaniment of party thumps).

Luther was the great original, Melancthon, to speak R.A.F.-wise, the first Protestant "type." But did Melancthon clarify or petrify the new doctrinal ferment? Dr Hildebrandt sets the problem squarely when he tells us that Melancthon "enjoys the unqualified confidence of Luther. He is only the humanist with whom he comes to terms," even though at the end of the discussion we still wonder whose terms they were, Luther's or Melancthon's? The book begins with a fine sketch of the relations between the two men—beginning on Luther's side with an almost naïve pride in his young prodigy but always deepening with a constant generosity, while Melancthon's dependence on the stronger spirit (with a jealous possessiveness recalling Charles Wesley's attitude to John) responded in its own minor key. In five chapters the book gets down to tactics—"Concessions to tradition, to reason, to law, to power, to opposition." The chapters abound with quotations and are as informative about Luther as about Melancthon, and contain much that is of great historical and theological value. The discussion of "natural theology" is perhaps one of Dr Hildebrandt's own concessions to modern theological debate, for the issues between Barth and Kraemer perhaps blur rather than illuminate the exactness of the sixteenth-century controversy. But the third chapter, "Concessions to Law," is masterly and with its constant references to the teaching of the Wesleys should be read by all who are interested in the relation between law and Gospel as one of the urgent and fundamental problems of our time.

The remaining chapters are garnished by reference to the German Church conflict under the Nazis, and what he has to say here will have to be taken into account in future discussions of Luther, Lutheranism and the State. Dr Hildebrandt does not refer to the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, which show the extent to which not only Melancthon but Luther himself was willing to make concessions to the English in the hope of a genuine agreement between Henry VIII and the Protestant League, but these articles fully support his conclusions, drawn from other sources.

We might say the book is curate's eggy (but some egg ! some curate !), for it has promise rather than fulfilment and perhaps deserves the criticism the author levels at English preaching, of taking the title as a "motto" and dodging off into "problems." But it is a very good book indeed, proof that its author has it in him to give us a very great book indeed. His English needs to be pruned still farther back of its occasional lapses and colloquialisms (he will need to be wary in a ministry whose scholars always tend to write as preachers); but that we judge his prose by austere standards is a tribute to the vast distances which already remove his from "refugees' English." Melancthon, often invited, never came to England (which burned its own Melancthon, John Frith, at the age of 24), but Bucer came here only because he was in flight and Erasmus because he was hard up. We may hope that Dr Hildebrandt will bring to us a theological gift of richness and distinction in the years to come.

There will, perhaps, be two classes of readers who will be at sea with this book. There will be those who see in all these controversies a mere "bellum grammaticale," and who will not apprehend the needful search for terminology and definition which has accompanied every great theological ferment (not less in the fourth than in the sixteenth century), and who need to be gently but firmly reminded that the vagueness of modern English theological discussion has long passed danger point. And there will be others who will need first to read some simple introduction to Protestant theology before turning to Dr Hildebrandt's sufficient demonstration that the teaching of the Reformers about Justification cannot be dismissed even by appeal to the magisterial authority of an Ipse Dix.

Gordon Rupp.

Wesley House,
Cambridge.

---

Realists and Nominalists. By Meyrick H. Carré. Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

*Realists and Nominalists* is a new and brief introduction to a long, unfinished debate. It is in the form of studies of four famous protagonists: Augustine, Abelard, Aquinas, and Occam. Each of these made his known contribution to the discussion, and we are given a sketch of the contemporary scene as well as of the mind of each. Thus within the modest compass of one small volume we swing between Platonist, Aristotelian, and Empiricist theories, and span a thousand years.

It is an exciting tale. The rôle of Augustine is not very clearly defined. But there is no doubt that Abelard is the Sir Galahad, with Aquinas as the King for whom he tilts. In the final episode, there is no sword Excalibur to pass from view, but only an ugly "razor," which is not easily mislaid. Beyond that let us not strain our allegory, for the piquancy of the record is that it is not romance but fact; a chronicle which is continuous with the metaphysical discussions and (on that account) the day-to-day affairs of our own century. This is a point to which Mr Carré gives a passing reference; it could have been clarified if before the argument opened we had been told in an additional chapter what it was to be about. As it is, we are kept waiting until Abelard appears before we are presented with the central problem. This is the problem of the "Universals." "The mark of a universal is the presence of elements which appear in a number of things or events, numerically distinct. It is an identity in difference." We are aware that "books or flowers or bombs" exist. What kind of existence can we attribute to "more general entities, shape, colour, learning, beauty, energy, money, the State, Democracy, mysticism"? If we do not choose to give an answer, are we faced with the dilemma, either that only these are *real* or that these are only *names*? Now, unless the modern reader is told plainly that the issues which are here involved govern his politics (totalitarian States are "realist," as is noted on page 38), his religion (some dialectical theologians, not unlike Luther, look like "nominalists"), his private life (few ethical theorists owe no debt either to Plato or to Aristotle), he is not likely to address himself to them.

If in Augustine we see the rough stuff of the debate being collected, if in Abelard the ground of common sense being cleared of an "incautious realism" and the opening of "men's minds for the renaissance of Aristotelian thought in the thirteenth century" (p. 53), if in Aquinas a moderate realism doing justice to both sides, we can watch in William each noble conception falling to bits. This is the warning tale of an Englishman which closes the book without comment. For "Occam" is the modern village of Ockham not far from Guildford, and here the Humian disturbances began. The author suggests that there was a change in the thought of William of Occam. In his later works he "changes his position concerning the nature of universals. He adheres to the main point that they are signs standing for groups of things. But instead of conceiving them as logical contents formed by the mind, he maintains that they are qualities or aspects of the mind itself. They inform the mind as white informs a wall" (p. 116). But this shift is small in comparison with the unchanged setting. Either way he was as impatient with philosophical predecessors as with ecclesiastical superiors. He cut himself off from English Christians, but he remained an English man.

Some details call for improvement. On page 21 Father Hugh Pope, O.P., appears as "Mr". There are reliable English translations of Gilson's *Spirit of Mediæval Philosophy* and of Rousselot's *Intellectualism of St Thomas*, and the 1936 edition of de Wulf's *Histoire de la Philosophie Médiévale* holds the field. It is desirable to say that there is an uncertainty of one year in establishing the birth of Aquinas, and that some

authorities date the birth of William of Occam as 1280 (instead of 1300), and his death as 1347 (instead of 1349). Nor is it easy to tell which of the sayings of the great thinkers here considered are not the common catchphrases of their contemporaries: for example, did not Henry of Harclay as well as William of Occam say: "*Nihil est in rerum natura extra animam nisi singulare*" ?

W. W. S. March.

King's College,
London.

---

A Sketch of Mediaeval Philosophy. By D. J. B. Hawkins. Sheed and Ward. 6s.

The time has passed when the medieval period was contemptuously dismissed by a brief reference in the histories of philosophy. We no longer consider the years between the closing of the schools of Athens and the appearance of Descartes as a "dogmatic slumber" of the human mind and we realize that the great thinkers of the Middle Ages said much that is relevant and valuable to the world of to-day. Unfortunately, the would-be student of medieval philosophy is handicapped by difficulty of access to the original works, the paucity of English translations and by the terminology employed which suggests to the modern reader that the medieval thinkers were concerned with problems remote from present-day interests.

There has long been a need for a short scholarly introduction to the history of medieval philosophy suited to the English reader who is not a specialist in this subject. Fr Hawkins has met this by his excellent little book.

His clear exposition of the sources and aims of medieval philosophy should dispel any lingering idea that it consisted in "a servile following of Aristotle and a bondage to the dogmas of the Church." The Universals Controversy is fully explained and the value of Abelard's contribution duly recognized.

The chapters dealing with the great system-builders of the thirteenth century, St Bonaventure, St Thomas, and Duns Scotus, are a model of compression and lucidity. Limitation of space probably prevented Fr Hawkins from considering the problems arising from St Thomas' view that *materia signata* is the principle of individuation in material things and his interesting contribution to the theory of temperament—a contribution which, when regard is paid to the terminology of the age, presents a parallel to the view of temperament held by such writers as McDougall.

The critical age of the fourteenth century is somewhat severely treated. In particular, William of Ockham, referred to earlier in the book as the founder of a new type of nominalism, is regarded as one of the chief causes of the decay of scholasticism. William's contemporaries called his view Terminism, and, far from being a nominalist, he may be regarded as an early exponent of conceptualism and so a forerunner of Kant.

The account of scholasticism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is an interesting summary of an achievement too little known to the student.

Fr Hawkins's book can be strongly recommended to all who are interested in the development of philosophical thought.

S. J. Curtis.

Leeds University.

---

Empirical Philosophies of Religion. By James Alfred Martin, Jr. King's Crown Press, New York.

The story of empirical religious philosophy in America is only a chapter in a much larger story, that of the whole development of the most characteristic movement in American philosophy from William James to Dewey, set over against the shifting idealism of Royce. It is the purpose of this careful and closely critical study to consider this chapter in itself, with only slight reference to its context in America and with even less reference, after the first three or four pages, to the broad background of empirical philosophy in Europe, with its determining concepts in Kant's "practical reason," Schleiermacher's "God-consciousness," and Ritschl's "value judgments." To this end five well-known American writers are taken, with varying philosophical standpoints, characterized by Mr Martin as follows: W. E. Hocking, Objective Idealist; E. S. Brightman, Personalistic Idealist; J. E. Boodin, Empirical Realist and Cosmic Idealist; D. C. Macintosh, Commonsense Realist; R. N. Wieman, Theistic Naturalist.

These writers all stand within the Christian tradition, to which indeed they owe their inspiration. They are all profoundly unorthodox, from the point of view of accepted Christian orthodoxy. But their unorthodoxy has not the rebelliousness of the heretic, since they are not primarily theologians, but rather the sincerity of the inquiring mind. It is heresy not with a banner but with a question mark. And the differing philosophical standpoints result in different unorthodoxies, deriving at least in part from a different understanding of what is implied in the empirical method. "In appealing to essentially the same type of experience Hocking finds Other Mind where Wieman finds Creativity. Brightman's religious interpretation of the whole of experience leads him to posit a Cosmic Person where Boodin posits a Cosmic Spirit or context. And Macintosh, appealing to a different sort of experience, finds God to be empirically a divine value-producing factor operative in ethico-religious salvation."

But this means that the whole basis of the appeal to experience, in religion or in philosophy, needs very careful re-examination. The most valuable part of Mr Martin's work is that he makes a number of fruitful suggestions, based in part upon Dewey's *Empirical Survey of Empiricisms*, for the clarification of the issues. The major difficulty is well known—namely, that of deciding between public and private experience, the observable and measurable matter of which an experimental account can be given, or the matter which depends upon an inward verification only and which can only be authenticated by personal testimony. Mr Martin argues strongly and ably for the former of these approaches, as a consequence of his critical survey of the writers selected.

In so doing he makes a number of shrewd observations which point

beyond this present study. Perhaps the most far-reaching is his hint of the importance of the modern study of the correlation of form and content in metaphysics, with the comment that these writers "have devoted chief attention to the interpretation in metaphysical terms of the content of religious experience and belief, with too little attention to the rôle of symbolic form and historical association in the meaning and expression of such belief and practice." Would that Edwyn Bevan were still with us to take up the challenge and add another volume to *Symbolism and Belief*.

L. W. Grensted.

Oxford.

---

Armenia and the Byzantine Empire: A Brief Study of Armenian Art and Civilization. By Sirparpie der Nersessian. Harvard University Press. $3.

The theologian will turn first to the chapter on religious controversies, which are discussed from the point of view of a learned and highly intelligent Severian Monophysite. The first part of Mlle der Nersessian's narrative does not add much to the more objective and better balanced presentation of the facts of Armenian history in Mgr Ormanian's *Church of Armenia*, published in an English translation in 1912. In the twelfth century, where she breaks some fresh ground, she fails to explore the implications of Byzantine and Latin rivalry for the support of the Cilician princes and churches, Armenian and Jacobite. Her historical survey includes some interesting instances of Armenians in the service of the Byzantine church and empire who retained Armenian names and interests. These might have been used to modify the picture of unrelenting and continuous hostility between the churches. There is a good deal of evidence that Armenian *émigrés* in Byzantium considered themselves in communion with Constantinople and Etchmiadzin until the eleventh century.

The larger and better part of Mlle der Nersessian's book is concerned with Armenian art. Her discussion of architecture, illustrated by plates, envelope diagrams, and ground plans, is of much more than historical interest to us to-day, for Armenian church architecture developed from very elementary forms to full maturity solely to satisfy a Christian liturgical need. It is therefore more essentially connected with the necessities of Christian worship than Byzantine or Gothic. The chapters on sculpture and painting provide a wealth of detailed description. It is odd that though the author has discovered an Iconoclast controversy in Armenia in about 600 A.D., a hundred years before the main outbreak in the Byzantine empire, she does not notice the striking resemblance between the "Early Christian cycle" on the north and south façades at Aght'amar and literary descriptions of Iconoclast art. The connection with Egypt is noticed, and might be further explored through a comparison of the birds with the very Egyptian wildfowl on mosaic pavements in Palestine. More interesting comparisons are made with Sasanian Persian work. Parallels could be drawn between Armenian and Irish treatment of birds and human figures. We are evidently here in touch with one of the largest stores of material for the

history of the unhellenic, anticlassical element in Christian symbolism and iconography. Mlle der Nersessian's reserve and objectivity in description, in reaction perhaps from the excitements engendered by Strzygowski, make her book of real value to those who will never be able to visit Armenia.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

KELHAM.

## SHORTER NOTICES

*The Soul's Betrothal-Gift.* By Hugh of St Victor. Translated by F. S. Taylor. Dacre Press. 3s.

"Somewhat (the soul) seeketh," says Hooker (*E.P.*, I, xi, 4), "and what that is directly it knoweth not, yet very intentive desire thereof doth so incite it, that all other known delights and pleasures are laid aside, they give place to the search of this but only suspected desire." This lovely dialogue, "containing the distillation of the author's psychology, philosophy, and lifelong prayer," should bring many, in all stages of growth, to a clearer sense not only of the depth of their deepest desires, but also of their proper but sometimes only suspected object, the increasingly "incomprehensible certainty," which is God. The medium of knowledge in the Christian life is love. Christ's Person, work, and teaching are understood properly only by those who love Him. Hence it is of the first importance (and such delightful translations as the present are making it easier) for priests to introduce their people to the spiritual and mystical writers, since these are pre-eminently the doctors of love in the Church; otherwise, the present welcome but still embryo return to the emphasis of sound doctrine in preaching will succeed only in perplexing, and possibly in leading both clergy and laity into the abyss of justification by right views.

J. K. BYROM.

NESTON-IN-WIRRAL.

*Discerning the Signs of the Times.* By Reinhold Niebuhr. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

This is a fresh volume of Dr Niebuhr's sermons or "sermonic essays," as he calls them. It is comparable with *Beyond Tragedy*, and like that volume will serve as a useful introduction to Niebuhr's teaching for those who wish to have a taste before they take a mouthful. To the confirmed Niebuhrian there will be little here that is novel, but he will be thankful for these examples of prophetic preaching for the post-war world, especially for the warnings addressed to the "victor" powers. There is always surprise to be found in the way that Niebuhr brings his regular insights to bear on fresh forms of the cosmic and human drama. Some look eagerly for any new work by Damon Runyon, others for any new work by Reinhold Niebuhr, wondering in each case whether it will be up to standard. Personally I belong to both classes,

and can assure the initiated that this is up to standard. But I hope Niebuhr's next volume of sermons will contain one on the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit.

A. R. V.

---

*Article XXXVII and War.* By Percy Hartill. Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. 6d.

This is not a piece of pacifist propaganda, but a judicious inquiry concerning the meaning and effect of the Article. The standard commentaries on the Articles are somewhat elusive at this point, and Archdeacon Hartill's pamphlet supplements what they say in a manner that will be useful to ordination candidates and instructive to other students as well.

A. R. V.

---

*The Magnet of the Cross.* By George Seaver. S.P.C.K. 1s.

This little book consists of a series of short addresses delivered—presumably at the Three Hours Service—in Worcester Cathedral on Good Friday, 1945. The addresses have been well thought out and carefully written. They are a reminder that the Passion of our Lord can be meditated upon from an unlimited number of angles. There are ten addresses in all, if we include the introductory remarks. Mr Seaver brings before us some of the personalities contributing to the Passion or associated with it—St Peter, Caiaphas, Herod, Pilate, the soldiers, the dying thief—and applies to ourselves the lessons provided by the way in which each of those personalities and the soldiers in turn behaved. Always the emphasis is upon how we ourselves would have reacted had we been faced with the same problems as presented themselves to these different persons. What should we have done if we had been in St Peter's shoes, or in Herod's, or in Pilate's?

The book is well worth the shilling which it costs, and deserves careful study. Incidentally, the Scripture passage quoted for reading in introduction to the address on Caiaphas does not seem to be the right one, but this error can easily be corrected in any subsequent edition.

D. G. Lewis.

Welshpool.

---

*Grant us Thy Salvation.* By H. G. G. Herklots. S.P.C.K. 1s.

This is designed to help us to intercede. Any help is welcome, especially if intercession and thanksgiving are thought to be the core of gospel prayer. But this book did not help me to overcome the twin difficulties of being particular and of caring. It is diffuse and thematic, dispersing sentiment instead of involuting it upon the petition so that, for example, the crowded "tube" can be churned down into a *cri de cœur* for the shepherdless. Why wasn't Bishop Andrewes at that C.M.S. conference?

M. P. Ralph-Bowman.

Ashbrittle.

*Printed in Great Britain by*
*Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher*